

# University of Wollongong - Research Online

## Thesis Collection

Title: Optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) and its applications in radiation therapy dosimetry

Author: Bin Hu

Year: 2010

Repository DOI:

### Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.**

Research Online is the open access repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: [research-pubs@uow.edu.au](mailto:research-pubs@uow.edu.au)

2010

## Optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) and its applications in radiation therapy dosimetry

Bin Hu  
*University of Wollongong*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses>

### University of Wollongong

#### Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

### Recommended Citation

Hu, Bin, Optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) and its applications in radiation therapy dosimetry, Doctor of Philosophy thesis, University of Wollongong. School of Engineering Physics, University of Wollongong, 2010. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3181>

## **NOTE**

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

## **UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG**

### **COPYRIGHT WARNING**

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**OPTICALLY STIMULATED LUMINESCENCE (OSL)  
AND ITS APPLICATIONS IN  
RADIATION THERAPY DOSIMETRY**

*A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree*

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
FROM THE  
UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

BIN HU  
ENGINEERING PHYSICS  
2010

## **CERTIFICATION**

I, Bin Hu, declare that this thesis, submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an award of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Biological Sciences, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

Bin Hu

18 October 2010

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to Professor Yang Wang, for promoting my research project and supporting the experimental work. I would also like to give my greatest thanks to Professor William Zealey, for his valuable advice and guidance. They have provided strong support; their supervision and leadership helped me tremendously.

My thanks also to all the staff of the Radiation Oncology Associated (ROA) at St. Vincent's Private, Sydney, for providing me the opportunity to undertake this research project and to complete my thesis.

I would like to acknowledge a scholarship from the School of Engineering Physics, University of Wollongong, Australia.

I give my grateful thanks to my parents, my dad, Yimin Hu, for offering his knowledge for phantom design, thesis review, and for helping me accomplish this project; my mother, Xilan Han, for taking care of my son. Without their support and their constant love I could not have started or completed this project.

I give a special thank to one who doesn't want to be mentioned, but he knows who he is and what he did for me.

## Abstract

Optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) was studied using a commercial OSL dosimetry system developed by Landauer (Landauer Inc.,USA) to analyse the possibility of using OSL dosimetry for external beam radiotherapy planning checks and in-vivo dosimetry. Experiments were performed to determine signal sensitivity, dose response range, beam type and energy dependency, reproducibility and linearity. Optical annealing processes to test OSL material reusability were also studied. OSL clinical usability was assessed by verifying IMRT dose distributions in a phantom and measuring exit doses for in-vivo dosimetry.

Experimental results show that OSL dosimetry provides a wide dose response range as well as good linearity and reproducibility for doses up to 600cGy, and up to 800cGy shows a 2.0% maximum deviation from linearity. The standard deviation in the response of screened dosimeters was 2.0%. As this needs to be taken into account when OSLDs are used clinically, multiple readings of each irradiated OSLD are recommended. OSLDs can be reused when an optical annealing process is applied, which can restore the OSLD to its original state. After optical annealing using incandescent light, the readout intensity decreased by approximately 98% in the first 30 minutes, decreasing further after repeated optical annealing according to the power law,  $I \propto t^{-1.3}$ , where I is the light intensity.

Quantitative comparisons were made between treatment planning system (TPS) calculated dose and OSL measurement points dose using a custom-designed spherical phantom. Three clinical IMRT cases were used: Nasopharynx, Prostate and Lung. Although quantitative comparisons are highly dependent on the calibration accuracy and dose range of OSLDs, experimental results showed that the OSL dose is within 3% of the TPS calculated dose with careful calibration. Quantitative comparisons were made between various backscatter material conditions when performing exit

dosimetry. OSLD dose was 5.7% lower when no backscatter material was added compared to full backscatter. Adding 0.5cm to 1.0cm water equivalent material reduced the dose by 2%. The reduction in dose may vary due to the density of the tissue in the primary beam path. These measurements demonstrated the importance of adding appropriate backscatter material to improve the accuracy of the readings.

One made quantitative comparisons between OSL measurements and the depth dose data from linear accelerator commissioning and those of a Markus ion chamber by using a custom-designed heterogeneous phantom. Compared to the depth dose data, OSL dose is 1% lower in the full backscatter condition, 2% with a 1cm backscatter and there is a maximum of 6% reduction with no additional backscatter added. Compared to the Markus ion chamber OSL readings show an insignificantly lower dose. Added backscatter thickness, field size, energy, tissue or a tumour's size and density along the primary beam path-length, as well as the control/calibration dose will all affect OSL response in in-vivo dosimetry.

The research work shows that OSL dosimetry can be an alternative dosimetry technique for use in radiotherapy, especially for patient specific Quality Assurance (QA) including skin dose measurement, IMRT plan checks, and linear accelerator QA. In conclusion, OSL dosimetry can provide an alternative dosimetry technique for use in radiotherapy if rigorous measurement protocols are established.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT.....	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	III
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XII
LIST OF TABLES.....	XVIII

## **Part One: Overview and Literature**

<b>Chapter 1 General Overview.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Optically Stimulated Luminescence.....	1
1.2 Historical development of OSL dosimetry and its applications .....	1
1.3 Sturcture of this thesis.....	6
1.4 Summary of this study.....	8
<b>Chapter 2 Physical Aspects of Optically Stimulated Luminescence.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Luminescence theory.....	12
2.2 Stimulated relaxation phenomena (SRP) .....	14
2.3 The energy transition of luminescence process.....	15
2.4 Mathematical description of OSL.....	16
2.5 Photoionisation cross-section.....	18
2.6 Three main OSL modes .....	19
2.6.1 Continuous wave OSL (CW-OSL) .....	20
2.6.1.1 Mechanism and process.....	21
2.6.1.2 Temperature influence.....	22
2.6.1.3 Theoretical explanation of the temperature dependence of OSL.....	23
2.6.1.4 Excitation power .....	25
2.6.1.5 Dose effect.....	25
2.6.2 Linear modulated OSL (LM-OSL) .....	25
2.6.2.1 Mechanism and process.....	25
2.6.2.2 Characteristic of LM-OSL curves.....	26

2.6.2.3 Relationship between LM-OSL and CW-OSL.....	27
2.6.2.4 Advantages of LM-OSL technique.....	28
2.6.3 Pulsed OSL (POSL) .....	28
2.6.3.1 Mechanism and process.....	28
2.6.3.2 Characteristic of POSL curve.....	29
2.6.3.3 Relationship between POSL and CW-OSL.....	30
2.6.3.4 Advantages of POSL technique.....	31
2.7 Summary.....	31
<b>Chapter 3 OSL Properties of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>:C.....</b>	<b>32</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	33
3.2 Historical overview of Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C development.....	34
3.3 Crystal structure of Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C .....	35
3.4 Characteristics of Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C .....	36
3.4.1 Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C stimulation and emission characteristics.....	36
3.4.1.1 Stimulation .....	36
3.4.1.2 Luminescence .....	38
3.4.2 The OSL response of Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C to radiation exposure.....	40
3.4.2.1 Good response linearity over wide dose range .....	40
3.4.2.2 Reusability .....	41
3.4.3 Temperature dependence of Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C OSL.....	42
3.4.4 OSL signal zeroing from Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C.....	46
3.4.4.1 Thermal annealing.....	46
3.4.4.2 Bleaching with stimulation light.....	47
3.5 Summary.....	47
<b>Chapter 4 Literature review of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>:C based OSL measurement technologies in medical dosimetry.....</b>	<b>49</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	49
4.2 Risø TL/OSL reader.....	50
4.3 OSL real-time optical fibre dosimetry technique (Standard Risø TL/OSL measurement system) .....	52
4.3.1 Introduction.....	52

4.3.2. Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C OSL fibres in in-vivo dosimetry.....	53
4.3.3 Main components of the OSL fibre reader.....	55
4.3.4 Measurement procedures and data processing algorithms.....	56
4.3.4.1 RL and post-irradiation OSL measurement procedure .....	56
4.3.4.2 Periodic OSL stimulation.....	56
4.3.5 OSL fibre system dosimetry characteristics.....	57
4.3.5.1 Reproducibility.....	57
4.3.5.2 Energy dependence.....	58
4.3.5.3 Dose-rate dependence.....	58
4.3.5.4 Angular dependence.....	58
4.3.6 OSL fibre system clinical applications and performances in radiotherapy.....	58
4.3.6.1 For measurements of depth dose and off-axis dose distributions .....	58
4.3.6.2 <i>In-vivo</i> measurements in head and neck IMRT plan.....	58
4.4 Summary.....	59
<b>Chapter 5 Literature review of the tools and techniques used in in-vivo         dosimetry in radiation therapy .....</b>	<b>61</b>
5.1 Introduction.....	61
5.2 Definition and concept of in-vivo dosimetry.....	63
5.3 The requirement for clinical accuracy and consistency.....	64
5.4 Diode dosimeters in in-vivo dosimetry.....	65
5.4.1 History of diodes for in-vivo dosimetry.....	65
5.4.2 Diode detectors and electrometers.....	66
5.4.3 Characteristics of diodes used in in-vivo dosimetry.....	66
5.4.4 QA of diodes for in-vivo dosimetry.....	67
5.4.5 Clinical application of diodes for in-vivo dosimetry .....	68
5.5 Thermoluminescence detectors (TLDs) in in-vivo dosimetry.....	68
5.5.1 History of TLDs for in-vivo dosimetry.....	68
5.5.2 TL dosimeters and readout systems of TLD .....	68
5.5.2.1 TL dosimeters.....	68
5.5.2.2 TL readers.....	69

5.5.3 Characteristics of TLDs for in vivo dosimetry.....	70
5.5.4 QA of TLDs for clinical in-vivo dosimetry .....	71
5.5.5 Clinical applications of TLDs in in-vivo dosimetry .....	72
5.6 Electronic portal imaging devices (EPIDs) for in vivo dosimetry.....	72
5.7 Metal oxide semiconductor field-effect transistors (MOSFETs) in <i>in-vivo</i> dosimetry .....	72
5.8 Summary.....	74

## **Part Two: Experiments**

### **Chapter 6 Evaluation of Landauer's microStar™ system and OSL dosimeters for radiotherapy.....75**

6.1 Introduction.....	75
6.2 Instrumentation.....	75
6.2.1 InLight OSL Dosimeter (OSLD) .....	75
6.2.2 InLight™ manual microStar™ reader system.....	77
6.3 Methodology.....	78
6.3.1 Establishing a standard baseline for reader performance.....	78
6.3.2 Reader reproducibility / stability with OSL dosimeters.....	79
6.3.3 Random fluctuations of repeated readings .....	79
6.3.4 Random orientation error of dot dosimeter .....	80
6.4 Results and discussion.....	80
6.4.1 Reader performance test.....	80
6.4.2 Reader reproducibility / stability with OSL dosimeters.....	81
6.4.3 Random fluctuations of repeated readings.....	85
6.4.4 Random orientation error of dot dosimeter evaluation.....	85
6.5 Summary.....	86
6.6 Conclusion.....	87

### **Chapter 7 Performance of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>:C Optical Luminescent Dosimeters (and specifically, Landauer's InLight™ Dosimeter) for Clinical Radiation Therapy Applications .....89**

7.1 Introduction.....	89
-----------------------	----

7.2 Instrumentation.....	92
7.2.1 OSL Dosimeters and reader system.....	92
7.2.2 Irradiation equipment .....	92
7.2.2.1 Radiation source.....	92
7.2.2.2 Solid slab square phantom.....	92
7.2.2.3 Solid sphere phantom.....	93
7.2.3 Annealing light source.....	94
7.3 Methodology.....	94
7.3.1 Irradiation setup.....	94
7.3.2 Sensitivity.....	97
7.3.2.1 Variation of sensitivity.....	97
7.3.2.2 Sensitivity factor .....	97
7.3.2.3 Dose and beam energy dependence.....	98
7.3.3 Dose-response curve linearity, dynamic range and dependence on beam quality .....	98
7.3.4 Directional / angular dependence.....	99
7.3.5 Incremental exposure characteristic.....	100
7.3.6 Post-irradiation readout time dependence.....	100
7.3.7 Reciprocity effects affecting OSL materials.....	100
7.3.8 Optical annealing.....	101
7.3.9 OSL signal fading and re-use possibility.....	101
7.4 Results.....	101
7.4.1 Sensitivity.....	101
7.4.1.1 Sensitivity factor.....	101
7.4.1.2 Sensitivity curve vs. dose and beam energy.....	103
7.4.2 Dose-response linearity and dynamic range.....	102
7.4.3 Beam quality dependence.....	106
7.4.4 Directional / Angular dependence .....	109
7.4.5 Incremental exposure /Accumulated dose.....	109
7.4.6 Post-irradiation readout time dependence.....	111
7.4.7 Reciprocity.....	113

7.4.8 Optical Annealing.....	114
7.4.9 Fading and reuse ability .....	116
7.5 Summary.....	117
7.6 Conclusion.....	119
<b>Chapter 8 Preliminary Study of OSL use for Patient Dose Verification in Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy (IMRT).....</b>	<b>121</b>
8.1 Introduction.....	121
8.2 Instrumentation.....	125
8.2.1 OSLdosimeters and reader system .....	125
8.2.2 The spherical phantom used in OSL calibration and IMRT dose verification planning.....	125
8.2.3 Irradiation source .....	126
8.2.4 CT scanner and TPS system.....	126
8.3 Methodology.....	127
8.3.1 Calibration of OSL dosimeters.....	127
8.3.2 Patient's IMRT cases.....	127
8.3.3 IMRT plan dose verification procedure.....	128
8.3.4 OSL measurement data analysis.....	130
8.3.5 Setup uncertainty evaluation from TPS.....	134
8.4 OSL measurement results.....	134
8.4.1 Nasopharynx IMRT plan dose verification.....	134
8.4.2 Prostate IMRT plan dose verification.....	136
8.4.3 Lung IMRT plan dose verification.....	137
8.4.4 Setup uncertainty evaluation.....	137
8.4.4.1 Nasopharynx IMRT case .....	138
8.4.4.2 Prostate IMRT case.....	139
8.4.4.3 Lung IMRT case.....	139
8.5 Summary and discussion.....	140
8.6 Conclusion .....	141

## **Chapter 9 Preliminary Study of OSL Used for Patient Skin Exit Dose Dosimetry in Megavoltage X-ray beams.....143**

9.1 Introduction.....	143
9.2 Instrumentation.....	145
9.2.1 Standard electron density phantom.....	145
9.2.2 In-house made phantom .....	145
9.2.3 Computer Tomography (CT) Scanner.....	146
9.2.4 Radiation source.....	146
9.2.5 PTW-Freiburg Advanced Markus Ion-Chamber and Fluke Electrometer .....	147
9.2.6 Optical Stimulated Luminescent (OSL) dosimetry system .....	148
9.3 Experiment preparation: Converting CT number to density.....	148
9.3.1 Methodology.....	150
9.3.2 Results.....	150
9.4 Effective path-length (EPL) correction.....	151
9.5 Verification in-house phantom using PTW Markus Ion-Chamber .....	153
9.5.1 PDD, TPR, an TMR.....	153
9.5.2 Methodology.....	154
9.5.3 Results.....	155
9.6 Verification an OSL dosimetry system in in-house phantom.....	156
9.6.1 Methodology.....	156
9.6.2 Results.....	157
9.7 Summary of experiment.....	160
9.8 Exit dose Dosimetry using Markus Ion-chamber .....	160
9.9 Effect of back scatter thickness on the dose variations.....	162
9.9.1 Markus Experiment 1: Measurement performed at isocentre in in- house homogenous phantom.....	162
9.9.1.1 Methodology.....	162
9.9.1.2 Results.....	163
9.9.2 Markus Experiment 2: Measurement point set on the exit surface in a homogeneous phantom.....	165

9.9.2.1 Methodology.....	165
9.9.2.2 Results.....	167
9.10 Markus Experiment 3: Exit dose vs. Field Size.....	173
9.10.1 Methodology.....	173
9.10.2 Results.....	174
9.11 Markus Experiment 4: Exit dose vs. Energy influence.....	175
9.11.1 Methodology.....	175
9.11.2 Results.....	176
9.12 Markus Experiment 5: Verification Markus ion-chamber measurement data .....	177
9.12.1 Methodology .....	177
9.12.2 Results.....	178
9.13 Markus Experiment 6: Exit Dose variation vs. the size of tissue equivalent materials inserts.....	181
9.13.1 Methodology.....	181
9.13.2 Results.....	182
9.14 Summary for exit dose dosimetry using Markus ion-chamber .....	184
9.15 Exit dosimetry using OSLD.....	185
9.16 Calibration of OSLDs.....	186
9.17 OSL Experiment 1: Measurement performed at isocentre in homogeneous phantom.....	188
9.17.1 Methodology.....	188
9.17.2 Results.....	189
9.18 OSL Experiment 2: Measurement performed at isocentre in a heterogeneous phantom .....	191
9.18.1 Methodology.....	191
9.18.2 Results.....	193
9.19 Summary of section 9.17~9.18.....	195
9.20 OSL Experiment 3: Verification Markus ion-chamber measurement data .....	196
9.20.1 Methodology.....	196
9.20.2 Results.....	197



9.21 OSL Experiment 4: Measurement point set on the exit surface on the beam axis in heterogeneous phantom.....	205
9.21.1 Methodology.....	205
9.21.2 Results.....	206
9.22 OSL Experiment 5: Comparison of OSL measurement data to clinical TMR data and Markus ion chamber data.....	209
9.22.1 Methodology.....	209
9.22.2 Results.....	210
9.23 OSL Experiment 6: Exit dose vs. Field Size.....	217
9.23.1 Methodology.....	217
9.23.2 Results.....	218
9.24 Discussion on the factors influenced the exit dose measurements.....	219
9.25 Conclusion.....	219
<b>Chapter 10 Conclusions and recommendations.....</b>	<b>223</b>
<b>Reference.....</b>	<b>229</b>
<b>Appendix A Guide for OSL Dosimetry Radiotherapy Protocol Design....</b>	<b>253</b>
<b>Appendix B Original data for the figure in the thesis .....</b>	<b>257</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 2.1 Simplified illustrations of luminescence excitation and emission in crystals
- Figure 2.2 Schematic energy band diagram of stimulated phenomena
- Figure 2.3 Occupancy of forbidden gap states
- Figure 2.4 A schematic of the possible optical absorption transitions in an insulator.
- Figure 2.5 Schematic diagrams of three main OSL stimulation methods: CW-OSL, LM-OSL, and POSL
- Figure 2.6 A model combining all the possible traps in an OSL sample
- Figure 2.7 OSL decay curves.
- Figure 2.8 Schematic representation of the processes that may give rise to a temperature dependence for OSL production
- Figure 2.9 Experimental LM-OSL curves from  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$ .
- Figure 2.10 Stimulated LM-OSL curves for first-order kinetics, using three different values of the product  $\sigma\gamma$ .
- Figure 2.11 Comparison between CW-OSL, transformed Pseudo-LM-OSL and experimental LM-OSL curves from a Na-feldspar sample.
- Figure 2.12 OSL decay curves acquired after a stimulation pulse from a laser at 25°C
- Figure 2.13 Schematic illustrating the variation in the ratio of the light emitted during a pulse to that emitted after the pulse as the pulse width changes for fixed stimulation energy per pulse.
- Figure 2.14 Ratio, represents the efficiency, of the luminescence emitted after the pulse to that emitted during the pulse
- Figure 3.1 Crystal structure of  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$
- Figure 3.2 Excitation spectra for OSL from  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  (TLD-500)
- Figure 3.3 Decay curve of OSL from  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  (TLD-500)
- Figure 3.4 Isometric plot of the stimulation spectra (200 ~ 320 nm) emission spectra (360 ~ 580 nm) from an irradiated 0.1% Mg-doped  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  sample.
- Figure 3.5 Comparison of OSL stimulation spectra (solid line) with photoconductivity after  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  irradiated 300 Gy by a  $^{60}\text{Co}$  source.
- Figure 3.6 Dose response for  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  powder.
- Figure 3.7 Dose responses for  $\alpha$ -  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  using POSL.
- Figure 3.8 Repeated single aliquot regeneration OSL measurements of  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  after exposed to the same dose of 4  $\mu\text{Gy}$   $^{60}\text{Co}$  gamma radiation.

- Figure 3.9 Dose reassessments for five repeated POSL measurement for the initial dose from 3x10.4 Gy to 2 Gy
- Figure 3.10 Time-resolved OSL from  $\alpha$ -  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  following irradiation at room temperature with a dose of 0.04 Gy  $^{90}\text{Sr}/^{90}\text{Y}$ .
- Figure 3.11 Arrhenius plot of the variation of the lifetime of the slow component as a function of temperature.
- Figure 3.12 Glow curves from (1) POST-quality, (2) TLD-quality, (3) DOSL-quality  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  samples irradiated at 200 K and heated at 0.5 K/s.
- Figure 3.13 Thermo-optical luminescence (TOL) characteristics of  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  after 1 Gy  $^{90}\text{Sr}/^{90}\text{Y}$  beta dose irradiation at room temperature and heated at 2°C/s.
- Figure 3.14 Plots of OSL signals against pre-heat temperature for  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  chips irradiated 1 Gy(dot), 110 mGy(square) and 100  $\mu\text{Gy}$ (triangle), respectively, using a  $^{90}\text{Sr}/^{90}\text{Y}$  beta source and measured at room temperature
- Figure 3.15 OSL decay curves from  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  dosimeters exposed over 15 and 72 hrs to the natural environmental radiation representing evaluated integrated doses of 0.98 and 5.10  $\mu\text{Gy}$ , respectively, compared to that from 43.5  $\mu\text{Gy}$   $^{60}\text{Co}$  gamma calibration dose
- Figure 3.16 OSL decay curve from  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  exposed to 110 mGy and 100  $\mu\text{Gy}$  beta radiation at room temperature, respectively
- Figure 4.1 Schematic drawing of Risø TL/OSL reader
- Figure 4.2 Schematic diagrams of the combined blue LED cluster and IR laser diode OSL unit
- Figure 4.3  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{:C}$  fibers at different stages of production
- Figure 4.4 Diagram of RL/OSL reader
- Figure 4.5 Two measurement techniques of OSL fibre readers.
- Figure 5.1 A typical glow curve of  $\text{LiF:Mg,Ti}$ (TLD-100) following  $^{60}\text{Co}$  irradiation to a dose level of 100 Gy taken at a heating rate of  $1\text{K/s}^{-1}$ .
- Figure 6.1 The InLight™ OSL dosimeter
- Figure 6.2 The InLight™ dot dosimeter
- Figure 6.3 Images of microStar™ reader
- Figure 6.4 Stability of the microStar reader for multiple CAL and LED counts.
- Figure 7.1 Schematic of standard  $30\times30\text{cm}^2$  solid water slabs (Computerized Imaging Reference System, Norfolk, VA, USA)
- Figure 7.2 A diagram of the spherical phantom including a template and other modifications for Dot OSL dosimeters.

- Figure 7.3a SSD irradiation setup for OSL detectors in a solid slab phantom to build two different equivalent depths:  $d_{max}$  of various beam qualities (were calculated to the depth of 2mm beyond the peak value of maximum PDDs) and 5 cm (for energy dependence experiments). The 10cm thickness below the OSL detector is for the back scatter.
- Figure 7.3b SAD irradiation setup for Stability and reproducibility experiment in a solid slab phantom
- Figure 7.4a Irradiation setup for OSL dosimeters in the spherical phantom with an additional mount for OSL placement. The isocentre was set to the centre of OSLD, as well as the centre of the phantom.
- Figure 7.4b The spherical phantom with additional components and OSL dot placement.
- Figure 7.5 The directional dependence experiment image
- Figure 7.6 OSL response comparisons over different energies.
- Figure 7.7a Dose-response curves for a 6MV photon beam with the dose range from 50cGy to 800cGy in solid slab phantom with build-up depth and 10 cm thickness back scatter depth.
- Figure 7.7b Partial dose-response curve for a 6MV photon beam with original data derived from Figure 7.7a.
- Figure 7.8 Dose-response curves for a 10MV photon beam with a dose range from 50cGy to 800cGy in solid slab phantom with a build-up depth and a 10 cm thickness back scatter depth.
- Figure 7.9 Energy dependence of OSL detectors for photon beams of 6 MV and 10 MV and electron beams with energies from 5MeV to 14 MeV.
- Figure 7.10 Response of OSL dosimeters under an incremental dose in cGy for 6MV Linear Accelerator irradiation
- Figure 7.11 Response of OSL dosimeters under an incremental dose (in cGy) for 6MV Linear Accelerator irradiation.
- Figure 7.12 Response of OSL dosimeters under an incremental dose (in cGy) for 6MV Linear Accelerator irradiation.
- Figure 7.13 Readout time dependencies with measurement reading differences after this group of OSL dosimeters was irradiated with a 500cGy calibrated dose.
- Figure 7.14 Reproducibility comparisons of 6 OSL dosimeters irradiated incrementally from 10cGy to 800cGy in a water with a 5cm build-up and 10cm back scatter
- Figure 7.15 Annealing Efficiency analysis with six OSLs irradiated to 500cGy with the annealed measurement readings acquired after the annealing process
- Figure 7.16 OSL re-use ability analysis.

Figure 8.1	Schematic of a Setup of a spherical phantom.
Figure 8.2	Schematic of OSL detectors in a spherical Phantom.
Figure 8.3	The setup of spherical phantom with OSL inserted on CT table
Figure 8.4	Schematic of setup of spherical phantom on Linear Accelerator for IMRT dose verification using OSLDs.
Figure 8.5	Nasopharynx IMRT treatment plan dose distribution
Figure 8.6	Prostate IMRT treatment plan dose distribution
Figure 8.7	Lung IMRT treatment plan dose distribution
Figure 8.8	Nasopharynx IMRT case: TPS calculated doses for 8 measurement points when the isocentre is shifted $\pm 2.0\text{mm}$ and $\pm 1.0\text{mm}$ in three directions in cross-sections (X: lateral, Y: longitudinal, Z: vertical)
Figure 8.9	Prostate IMRT case: TPS calculated doses for 8 measurement points when the isocentre shifted $\pm 2.0\text{mm}$ and $\pm 1.0\text{mm}$ in three directions in cross-sections (X: lateral, Y: longitudinal, Z: vertical)
Figure 8.10	Lung IMRT case: TPS calculated doses for 8 measurement points when the isocenter is shifted $\pm 2.0\text{mm}$ and $\pm 1.0\text{mm}$ in three directions cross-sections (X: lateral, Y: longitudinal, Z: vertical)
Figure 8.11	IMRT plan dose distribution verification experiment setup with a spherical phantom
Figure 9.1	CT image of the CIRS Phantom
Figure 9.2	Coronal view of the in-house phantom (a) without insert and PTW Markus ion-chamber placement; (b) with inserts and OSL placement
Figure 9.3	PTW Advanced Markus ion chamber
Figure 9.4	CT-to-mass density curve and CT-to-electron density curve of a standard CIRS M062 phantom with associated tissue equivalent inserts (dark blue) and an in-house phantom (red) associated with three samples (in different colours with labels on) through interpolation
Figure 9.5	Schematic of PTW Markus Ion-chamber calibrations
Figure 9.6	Schematic of OSL dosimeter calibration
Figure 9.7	Schematic setup of PTW Markus for back scatter thickness measurements with an effective measurement point at isocentre
Figure 9.8	Markus ion-chamber Experiment 1 results (1)
Figure 9.9	Markus ion-chamber Experiment 1 results (2)
Figure 9.10	Schematic of the setup for back scatter thickness influence measurements in a

#### Homogeneous phantom 1 for Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2

- Figure 9.11 Schematic of the setup for back scatter thickness influence measurements for a phantom with tissue equivalent material inserted, phantom 2 to phantom 4 of the Markus ion-chamber Experiment 1.
- Figure 9.12 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (1)
- Figure 9.13 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (2)
- Figure 9.14 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (3)
- Figure 9.15 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (4)
- Figure 9.16 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (5)
- Figure 9.17 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (6)
- Figure 9.18 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (7)
- Figure 9.19 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (8)
- Figure 9.20 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 2 results (9)
- Figure 9.21 Schematic of setup for back scatter thickness influence measurements for a phantom with tissue equivalent material inserted for Markus ion-chamber Experiment 3
- Figure 9.22 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 3 results (1)
- Figure 9.23 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 3 results (2)
- Figure 9.24 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 4 results (1)
- Figure 9.25 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 4 results (2)
- Figure 9.26 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 5 results (1)
- Figure 9.27 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 5 results (2)
- Figure 9.28 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 5 results (3)
- Figure 9.29 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 6 results (1):
- Figure 9.30 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 6 results (2):
- Figure 9.31 Markus ion-chamber Experiment 6 results (3):
- Figure 9.32 Schematic of OSL setup to assess the influence of back scatter thickness with the effective measurement point at isocentre in the homogeneous phantom used in OSL Experiment 1.
- Figure 9.33 OSL Experiment 1 results (1)
- Figure 9.34 OSL Experiment 1 results (2)
- Figure 9.35 Schematic of OSL setup to assess the influence of back scatter thickness with

the effective measurement point at isocentre in a homogeneous phantom for OSL Experiment 2.

- Figure 9.36 Experiment Exit Dose OSL Two results (1):
- Figure 9.37 OSL Experiment 2 results (2)
- Figure 9.38 OSL Experiment 3, verification and comparison of OSL measurement results (1)
- Figure 9.39 OSL Experiment 3, verification of OSL measurement result (2):
- Figure 9.40 OSL Experiment 3 results (3):
- Figure 9.41 Schematic of a setup to assess how back scatter thickness influence measurements with an effective measurement point at the exit surface on in a homogeneous phantom using the same tissue equivalent materials inserts as in OSL Experiment 4.
- Figure 9.42 OSL Experiment 4 results (1):
- Figure 9.43 OSL Experiment 4 results (2):
- Figure 9.44 OSL Experiment 5 results: verification and comparison of OSL measurement vs. TMR values (1)
- Figure 9.45 OSL Experiment 5 results: verification of OSL measurement results (2):

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Historical development of OSL dosimetry
Table 3.1	Historical Overview of Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> :C Development
Table 6.1	MicroStar Reader reproducibility test using a calibrated InLight™ Dot dosimeter from Landauer
Table 6.2	MicroStar Reader reproducibility test on calibrated InLight™ dosimeter from Landauer
Table 6.3	MicroStar Reader reproducibility test on a single exposure under 6MV Linear Accelerator (single detector pellicles, Inlight™ Dot Dosimeter) using doses of 50, 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, 700 and 800 cGy, respectively
Table 6.4	MicroStar Reader reproducibility test on a single exposure under a 6MV Linear Accelerator (Cartridges of 4 detector pellicles, Inlight™ dosimeter)
Table 6.5	Error analysis due to wrong orientation of a Dot dosimeter
Table 7.1	Sensitivity of 20 unscreened OSL dosimeters.
Table 7.2	Sensitivity of 7 screened dot OSLDs with irradiation 100 cGy. The OSLDs were put in a 30cm x 30cm slab phantom at a SAD of 100cm with 10 cm build-up.
Table 7.3.	The raw readings for beam quality dependence with different OSL dosimeter groups irradiated by 6 MV photons using doses ranging from 50cGy to 800cGy.
Table 7.4	Beam quality dependence for 6MV and 10MV photon and 5,7,9,10,12 and 15 electron beams with irradiated dose range from 50cGy to 600cGy. The OSL response are normalized to the mean value of all the energies
Table 7.5	Beam quality dependence for 6MV and 10MV photon beams with an irradiated dose range from 50cGy to 800cGy. The OSL responses are normalized to the mean value of all the energies.
Table 7.6	Beam quality dependence for 5,7,9,10,12 and 14 electron beams with an irradiated dose range from 50cGy to 600cGy. The OSL responses are normalized to the mean value of all the energies.
Table 7.7	Raw measurement readings of the directional dependence of OSLD
Table 7.8	Post-Irradiation reading time dependence
Table 7.9	Comparison of 4 OSL dosimeters irradiated incrementally from 10cGy to 800cGy in slab water phantom with a build-up depth and a 10cm back scatter depth. The readings were taken 5 times for each OSLs of each exposure. The difference between consecutive readouts were calculated and normalized to 1cGy dose.



Table 7.10	Annealing efficiency comparing the ratio of measurement reading changes between two different light sources, fluorescent (white) and Incandescent (yellow), by given 2 hours annealing. The ratio indicated a significant difference. Average readings were based on 8 OSL dosimeters of each group.
Table 7.11	Fading and reusability
Table 8.1	CT scan Protocols for IMRT cases
Table 8.2	OSL Point measurement verification results for the nasopharynx IMRT case. SD represents the standard deviation of averages of 5 readouts. $\Delta D$ represents the difference of OSLDs measured dose to that of TPS calculated. $\sigma$ represents setup uncertainty (2mm). <i>Diff (%)</i> represents the percentage difference of OSLDs measured dose to that of TPS calculated.
Table 8.3	OSL Point measurement verification result for the nasopharynx IMRT case. SD represents the standard deviation of averages of 5 readouts. $\Delta D$ represents the difference of OSLDs measured dose to that of TPS calculated. $\sigma$ represents setup uncertainty(2mm). <i>Diff (%)</i> represents the percentage difference of OSLD measured dose to that which was calculated using a TPS.
Table 8.4	OSL Point measurement verification results for the nasopharynx IMRT case. SD represents the standard deviation of the averages of 5 readouts. $\Delta D$ represents the difference of OSLDs measured dose to that of TPS calculated. $\sigma$ represents setup uncertainty (2mm). <i>Diff (%)</i> represents the percentage difference of OSLDs measured dose to that of TPS calculated.
Table 9.1	CT numbers of various typical tissues or materials
Table 9.2	CT HU value (120kV, 200mA) vs. Mass Density and Electron Density
Table 9.3	Calculated equivalent thicknesses of phantom and tissue equivalent inserts
Table 9.4	Measurement data for the Verification and Calibration of a PTW Markus Ion-Chamber.
Table 9.5	Measurement data for the Verification and Calibration of OSL dosimeters (1).
Table 9.6	Measurement data for the Verification and Calibration of OSL dosimeters (2).
Table 9.7	Measurement data for Verification and Calibration of OSL dosimeters (3).
Table 9.8	Measurement data for Verification and Calibration of OSL dosimeters (4).
Table 9.9	Summary of the Verification and Calibration of OSLDs.
Table 9.10	Dose calibration of OSL dosimeters for exit dose measurement.
Table 9.11	OSL Experiment 1 result (1)
Table 9.12	OSL Experiment 1 result (2)
Table 9.13	OSL Experiment 2 results

Table 9.14 OSL Experiment 3 results

Table 9.15 OSL Experiment 4 results

Table 9.16 OSL Experiment 5 results

Table 9.17 OSL Experiment 6 results